

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/730,212	Applicant(s) HUBER ET AL.	
	Examiner Callie E. Shosho	Art Unit 1714	

All Participants:

(1) Callie E. Shosho.

(2) Edward Meilman.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 2 May 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

13

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in ~~the Notice of Allowability~~ Part II above.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Callie Shosho
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Meilman in order to clarify the scope of claim 13.

Given the examiner's position that the scope of the claim was confusing given that it was not clear how a polyoxyalkene amine is a copolymer of a polyethylene oxide and a polypropylene oxide or how the amine is selected from the group consisting of only one compound, the examiner's amendment was made to clarify that the polyoxyalkene amine is derived from a copolymer of polyethylene oxide and a polypropylene oxide.